

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/735,888	OTTERSBACH ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Kyle M. Riddle	3748	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kyle M. Riddle. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Charles Muserlian. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 10 January 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 10.

Identification of prior art discussed: Adachi and Seamone.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed applicant's remarks with regard to the last paragraph of claim 10. Applicant correctly argued that the Seamone reference has notched wedges that do not circle the entire annular opening, but applicant's invention is intended to do so. In order to clarify the invention over the prior cited art, it was agreed to do an Examiner's Amendment and insert the words "circumferentially extending" to specify that the different radii of the control regions extend all the way around the control piston.